

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ELMITCHKEBE KEBECHET EL,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOVERNOR TOM WOLF, ET. AL.,

Defendants.

NO. 3:19-cv-02222

(JUDGE CAPUTO)

**ORDER**

**NOW**, this 19th day of February, 2020, upon review of the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson (Doc. 6) for plain error or manifest injustice, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

- (1) The Report and Recommendation (Doc. 6) is **ADOPTED**.
- (2) Plaintiff's request to proceed in forma pauperis (Doc. 2) is provisionally **GRANTED**.
- (3) Plaintiff's complaint (Doc. 1) is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.<sup>1</sup>
- (4) The Clerk of Court is directed to mark the case as **CLOSED**.

/s/ A. Richard Caputo  
\_\_\_\_\_  
A. Richard Caputo  
United States District Judge

To the extent that the International Affidavit of Facts (Doc. 7), Notice to Agent (Doc. 8), and the Affidavit (Doc. 9) serve as the Plaintiff's objections to Magistrate Judge Carlson's Report and Recommendation, none of these documents points to specific errors in the Report and Recommendation. Thus, they fail to trigger de novo review. *See Morgan v. Astrue*, No. CIV.A.08-2133, 2009 WL 3541001, at \*3 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 30, 2009) (holding "that objections which merely rehash an argument presented to and considered by a magistrate judge are not entitled to de novo review.").